

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ALBANY DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

CHANDRA F. HENDERSON,

Defendant.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Case No. 1:13-CR-17 (WLS)

ORDER

Presently pending before the Court is Defendant Chandra Henderson's *Pro Se* Motion to Postpone Voluntary Surrender Date. (Doc. 28.) Therein, Defendant requests a stay of the date of her voluntary surrender on the grounds that she has filed a civil suit in this Court. (*Id.*) A review of the docket, however, reflects that Defendant is currently represented by Robert McLendon. (*See* Docket.) Mr. McLendon has not filed a motion to withdraw in this matter and Defendant provides no information about the status of Mr. McLendon as her counsel.

Therefore, because courts in this district do not accept *pro se* filings from criminal defendants who are represented by counsel, *United States v. Johnson*, No. 1:11-cr-12 (M.D. Ga. May 1, 2013) (Sands, J.) ("This Court has a longstanding practice of striking *pro se* filings from defendants who are represented by counsel."); *Harrison v. United States*, No. 1:07-cr-45, 2012 WL 3656432, at *1 (M.D. Ga. Aug. 24, 2012), Defendant's *Pro Se* Motion to Postpone Voluntary Surrender Date is **STRICKEN**.

Counsel for Defendant is hereby **ORDERED** to promptly provide Defendant a copy of this Order.¹

To the extent Defendant's *pro se* motion is considered a recusal motion, Defendant's *pro se* motion is due to be denied, even if properly filed. The undersigned is not a party to the 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Complaint filed by Defendant in Case No. 1:13-cv-140 (WLS). The undersigned played no role in the investigation, decision to prosecute, selection of charges or plea negotiations in this case, and no allegation of misconduct appears on the record of this case. All rulings and orders of the Court are of record for review on any appeal. As such, there is no basis for recusal under 28 U.S.C. § 455. Accordingly, Defendant's unauthorized *pro se* Motion is also hereby **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this 30th day of August, 2013.

/s/ W. Louis Sands

THE HONORABLE W. LOUIS SANDS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

¹ To the extent Defendant's *pro se* motion is considered a recusal motion, Defendant's *pro se* motion is hereby **DENIED**